



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/382,443	08/25/1999	YOUNG-KY KIM	678-343-(P88	5237

7590 07/09/2003

DILWORTH AND BARRESE
333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD
UNIONDALE, NY 11553

EXAMINER

CUMMING, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2683	P

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/382,443	KIM, ET AL
Examiner	Art Unit	
WILLIAM D. CUMMING	2683	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 11-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 11-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 August 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 16 June 2003 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2683.

2. Figures 1A, 1B, 7, and 8 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The proposed drawing correction filed on June 16, 2003 has been disapproved because it is not in the form of a pen-and-ink sketch showing changes in red ink or with the changes otherwise highlighted. See MPEP § 608.02(v).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 2, and 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sawashashi, et al** in view of **Bruckert** as stated in paragraph 7 of the Office action dated March 12, 2003.

7. Applicant's arguments filed June 16, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicants always had the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit. Rather, the *"PTO applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in applicant's specification."*

Sawashashi, et al's P(T) is the changing reference value as long P(T) is under the maximum power (note figure 10). By the way, so would applicants' system, since all real and physical systems would inherently have a maximum power, and not to mention any system in the United Sates as required by the Federal Communication Commission.

While the claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicants have provided a clear definition in the specification. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989)

KIM, ET AL

In response to applicants' argument that the references includes additional structure or functions not required by applicant's invention (like having a maximum power), it must be noted that the references disclose the invention as claimed. The fact that it discloses additional structure or functions not claimed is irrelevant.

If applicants continue to claim their invention in such broad terms, it should not come to surprise that then examiner is interrupted the claims just as broad.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

9. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. AMENDMENTS MAY NOW BE SUBMITTED IN REVISED FORMAT

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is permitting applicants to submit amendments in a revised format as set forth below. Further details of this practice are described in *AMENDMENTS IN A REVISED FORMAT NOW PERMITTED, signed January 31, 2003, expected to be published in Official Gazette in February, 2003* (Notice posted on the Office's web site at

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/revamdtprac.htm>).

The revised amendment format is essentially the same as the amendment format that the Office is considering adopting via a revision to 37 CFR 1.121 (Manner of Making Amendments). The revision to 37 CFR 1.121 (if adopted) will simplify amendment submission and improve file management. The Office plans to adopt such a revision to 37 CFR 1.121 by July of 2003, at which point compliance with revised 37 CFR 1.121 will be mandatory.

Effective immediately, all applicants may submit amendments in reply to Office actions using the following format. Participants in the Office's electronic file wrapper prototype¹ receiving earlier notices of the revised practice may also employ the procedures set out below.

REVISED FORMAT OF AMENDMENTS

Begin on separate sheets:

Each section of an Amendment (e.g., Claim Amendments, Specification Amendments, Remarks) should begin on a separate sheet. *For example, in an amendment containing a.) introductory comments, b.) amendments to the claims, c.) amendments to the specification, and d.) remarks, each of these sections should begin on a separate sheet.* This will facilitate the process of separately indexing and scanning of each part of an amendment document for placement in an electronic file wrapper.

Two versions of amended part(s) no longer required:

The current requirement in 37 CFR 1.121(b) and (c) to provide two versions (a clean version and a marked up version) of each replacement paragraph, section, substitute specification or claim will be waived where an amendment is submitted in the following format:

A) Amendments to the claims:

Each amendment document that includes a change to an existing claim, or submission of a new claim, **must include a complete listing** of all claims in the application. After each claim number, the status must be indicated in a parenthetical expression, and the text of each claim under examination (with markings to show current changes) must be presented. The listing will serve to replace all prior versions of the claims in the application.

¹ The Office's Electronic File Wrapper prototype program is described in *USPTO ANNOUNCES PROTOTYPE OF IMAGE PROCESSING, 1265 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 87* (Dec. 17, 2002) ("Prototype Announcement"), and applies only to Art Units 1634, 2827 and 2834.

- (1) The current status of all of the claims in the application, including any previously canceled or withdrawn claims, must be given. Status is indicated in a parenthetical expression following the claim number by one of the following: (original), (currently amended), (previously amended), (canceled), (withdrawn), (new), (previously added), (reinstated – formerly claim #_), (previously reinstated), (re-presented – formerly dependent claim #_), or (previously re-presented). The text of all pending claims under examination must be submitted each time any claim is amended. Canceled and withdrawn claims should be indicated by only the claim number and status.
- (2) All claims being currently amended must be presented with markings to indicate the changes that have been made relative to the immediate prior version. The changes in any amended claim should be shown by strikethrough (for deleted matter) or underlining (for added matter). An accompanying clean version is not required and should not be presented. Only claims of the status “currently amended” will include markings.
- (3) The text of pending claims not being amended must be presented in clean version, i.e., without any markings. Any claim presented in clean version will constitute an assertion that it has not been changed relative to the immediate prior version.
- (4) A claim may be canceled by merely providing an instruction to cancel. Listing a claim as canceled will constitute an instruction to cancel. Any claims added by amendment must be indicated as (new) and shall not be underlined.
- (5) All of the claims in each amendment paper must be presented in ascending numerical order. Consecutive canceled or withdrawn claims may be aggregated into one statement (e.g. Claims 1 – 5 (canceled)).

Example of listing of claims:

Claims 1-5 (canceled)

Claim 6 (withdrawn)

Claim 7 (previously amended): A bucket with a handle.

Claim 8 (currently amended): A bucket with a ~~green~~ blue handle.

Claim 9 (withdrawn)

Claim 10 (original): The bucket of claim 8 with a wooden handle.

Claim 11 (canceled)

Claim 12 (new): A bucket with plastic sides and bottom.

Claim 13 (previously added): A bucket having a circumferential upper lip.

Claim 14 (re-presented – formerly claim 11): A black bucket with a wooden handle.

KIM, ET AL

B) Amendments to the specification:

Amendments to the specification may be made by presenting a replacement paragraph, section or substitute specification marked up to show changes made relative to the immediate prior version. An accompanying clean version is not required and should not be presented.

C) Amendments to drawing figures:

Drawing changes may be made by presenting replacement figures which incorporate the proposed changes and which comply with § 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented in the remarks section of the amendment. If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not approved by the examiner, applicant will be informed in the next Office action. Any replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even though only one figure may be amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended."

Any questions regarding the submission of amendments pursuant to the revised practice set forth in this flyer should be directed to the following legal advisors in the Office of Patent Legal Administration (OPLA): Elizabeth Dougherty (Elizabeth.Dougherty@uspto.gov), Gena Jones (Eugenia.Jones@uspto.gov) or Joe Narcavage (Joseph.Narcavage@uspto.gov). For information on the waiver or legal aspects of the prototype, please contact Jay Lucas (Jay.Lucas@uspto.gov), Senior Legal Advisor (PCTLA) or Rob Clarke (Robert.Clarke@uspto.gov), Senior Legal Advisor (OPLA). Alternatively, further information may be obtained by calling OPLA at (703) 305-1616.

11. If applicants request an interview after this final rejection, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, in writing.

Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration.

Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied.

Application/Control Number: 09/382,443
Art Unit: 2683 07/06/03 10:01 PM
FINAL REJECTION


Page 9

KIM, ET AL

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Primary Examiner **WILLIAM D. CUMMING** whose telephone number is 703-305-4394. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 11:30am to 2:30pm, EDT.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Supervisory primary Examiner **WILLIAM TROST** can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-6075 for regular communications and 746-6075 for After Final communications.

14. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.


WILLIAM D. CUMMING
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2683

wdc
July 6, 2003



WILLIAM CUMMING
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
WASHINGTON, DC 20231
(703) 305-4394 (703) 746-6075 FAX
william.cumming@uspto.gov